#### The notion of fairness in this space is bullshit. I have shifted from Policy to PF to LD. It's all been ableist. The debate is structured through ableism. My freshman year, I couldn't travel out of state, so I could never attend bid tourneys. Policy debate is structured around speed, which, as someone who has dyslexia and a stutter, I was always left in the dust. PF was worse where Parent Judges can decide to screw you over because of your stutter, so you're the only 3-2 that doesn't break. LD is structured around hidden tricks designed to punish those who are dyslexic. But ohh accommodation can solve this problem I hear you saying. Accommodations have been weaponized where people like Cobin read spreading theory and then are told behind their back that they are doing it for the win. Debate as a whole is structured around researching, but how do you do this when the research is inaccessible. Or how am I supposed to have the time to do the research when I already struggle in school. The notion of prep groups requires social skills, which I have trouble with. Or what about my anxiety forcing me to stay up all night? Or what if I phase out during part of the round because of ADHD. I felt isolated during drills at camp because I was the only one not spreading. Not to say my lab mates weren't accommodating, but because I felt different. Or during practice debates at school where no one wants to debate me because that would mean writing a new aff to accommodate the disabled kid. Or me not being able to pull up my files because of my executive function skills. Disability functions as a form of narrative prosthesis. Debaters read Kritiks like this all time and yet don't do shit. They will go for a 1ar Stupid K and then make jokes about the next night in the chat. Or when the Disability is used as a function to profit off. Mollow is the most strategic, so we will read it but let's throw in log con for good measure. Disability functioning off the medical model misses the point. Sure, people have had success despite their Disability, but that misses the point that Disability isn't a static identity but rather a process of viewing people as lesser and based on social context. It's the same reason why dyslexics aren't allowed in the Paralympics. In this case, the social arbiter of context is the judge. This is a space where I have to abandon my identity to get wins. I have to read tricks against people who don't understand them to get wins. The space forces me to replicate the ableism forced onto me, onto others to win. The 1nc will come up here and say that Topicality is essential, or I should have done this as a Facebook post. The notion of change in the debate in the space is tied to you doing well. Those who don't well, like me, are cited off as a joke and not worth even listening to. I can leak all my prep, and no one would even bat an eye because it's not essential to them because of the stigma. The coaches in space are hired by those who were good in high school. When the space isn't accessible, I can never access fairness and education, which makes it a prerequisite to those concepts. When we endorse any form of fairness and education in the debate space, we are leaving others behind. LD debate, in particular, has become a place where the most strategic kritiks are fucking Semicapitalist with a bunch of tricks affirming. The literature is designed in a way where nothing of value matters because the space is filled with inaccessibility, so it's like two ships passing in the night. Even if you believe in Baudrillard, can people seriously say that the literature is being represented in a way other than to confuse people? This also has the side effect of creating an echo chamber where people only read the most extreme positions because it's the most strategic position using ontology to bully others out of the debate space. There are two impacts. First, it makes the space more ableist exclusionary. The traditional model of debate is gain of strength of ballot ignores how certain bodies are structurally positioned to be disadvantaged. I shouldn't have to justify why ableism is terrible, but I will. It's caused me mental strain where I always struggle to know why I even continue in the space anymore. The second is the destruction of debate because the more inaccessible and high theory it becomes, the less likely people for the skills to matter in real-life and leaves a sense of bullshit because they couldn't access the round.

#### What is the solution? I propose the Method of narrative experience or embodiment. Instead of focusing on bullshit of Extinction outweighs and high theory, let's focus on what really matters. Tying the discussion of our real-life experience means we always have an anchor point back to reality. It also allows minorities to discuss how real-life has affected them and tie that to the resolution and improving the debate space. Yes, this still allows for the research of critical literature and philosophy but if you have to rely on outside studies and power tagged cards then the space has lost its purpose. This Method still allows for clash but realizes that there is no educational value if we don't talk about real life.

#### Thus I affirm the resolution as a principle, The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. Framing mechanisms: You should reject Utilitarianism for prioritizing the majority over the minority. This has historically been used to justify eugenics and slavery. 2) Ideal theory is abstract garbage. They try to define what is human, but that realize on excluding disabled people to less than human, i.e., Kant and rational agency.

#### Contention 1:I ask when has corporation done shit for you. They profit off me when I need to take my meds to function in this space. They are designed for productivity to grow and grow and grow. While Elon musk is fucking blowing his off his fucking Billion on SpaceX while millions of people in the United States are starving. The appropriation of space is the next push forward the next goal they have. Instead, focus on helping the poor people on your own planet first.

#### Contention 2: Space has a meaningful use to harm minority bodies. Throughout the '60s, Clynes and Kline were accused of non-consensual human experimentation. But the triumph of human space travel drowned out the narratives about experimentation setting a precedent of forced testing. The notion of space travel has been tied to overcoming. We need to reach the moon and shit. Those seen as unfit were tossed aside and used as lab rats. The process of who gets into space is based on social context. Only those who are strong and intelligent can be an astronaut. And just like the debate space, this social context is always used to punish the disabled.

#### If there is no offense in this round, vote aff. We should take action to better improve the world. If they read an alternate method like truth testing that is an you up layer to which ever Method is better. Ballot functions based off strength so endorsing the best Method helps to set norms for future rounds. Also if they have to defend the status quo model of debate that I have had to suffer through then you should be able to defend why that model is good.